

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 8, 2009. With this Amendment claims 1, 21, 34 and 35 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged. **IT IS NOTED THAT EACH OF THESE CLAIMS HAS BEEN AMENDED TO REMOVE ONE OR MORE TERMS ADDED IN THE PREVIOUS RESPONSE, THEREBY BROADENING THE SCOPE OF THESE CLAIMS.** Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

NOTE REGARDING PTO CLOSURE DUE TO SNOW: Applicant notes that this Response is filed on 2/12/2010, which is the first day on which the PTO is open following the due date (2/6/2010, with 3-month extension) for this response. The PTO was closed from Monday, 2/8/2010 through Thursday, 2/11/2010.

I. Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 34 are amended to remove one or more terms added in the previous amendment, thereby broadening the claim. The term(s) added in the last response were not required to overcome the rejection. No new matter is presented. Entry is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under §102

In item 6 of the Office Action claim 1–3, 9–15, 18–21 and 24–35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Getting Results with Microsoft Office Results 97 pages 448–457, 563–573, and new pages 169–178, (hereinafter “Office Results”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 34 are directed to substantially similar features. For the purposes of efficiency only the features of claim 1 will be discussed in detail. Claim

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

1 as amended recites, “determining a relationship between the selected view and the base view...receiving a selection of at least one field of the fields; **determining if the selected field is drillable....**” (Emphasis added). There is nothing in the cited reference that discloses or anticipates selecting a field and determining if the selected field is drillable.

In addition, a prominent advantage described in the specification is that the systems and methods described therein are dynamic and user-generated. For example, page 5 of the specification states that “As the user selects fields, a report is generated which includes the selected fields and drill links associated with the fields.”

Although Applicant disagrees that a spreadsheet and pivot tables are appropriate references for this application, which deals with databases and database reports, for the sake of this particular response, Applicant notes that it is well known in the art that when an Excel spreadsheet contains a live link that is incorporated into a pivot table, the link does not remain live in the pivot table. Therefore, the requirement of claim 1 are not satisfied.

Claim 1 specifically recites:

“receiving a selection of at least one field of the fields;
determining if the selected field is a drillable; and
providing the at least one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer.”

As stated above, Excel does not do this. Therefore, it is impossible for the reference – which describes Excel – to disclose anything of the sort.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

By the same rationale discussed above, claim 34 is allowable over the cited reference, because claim 34 recites elements similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21 and 35 are directed to substantially similar features. For the purposes of efficiency only the features of claim 21 will be discussed in detail. Claim 21 recites “loading a **report definition** for the first report containing the selected drill link; determining a **relation path** associated with the selected drill link....” (Emphasis added). These features of claim 21 are not disclosed or anticipated by the cited reference. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

For the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 21, claim 35 is allowable over the cited reference, and the rejection of claim 35 should be withdrawn.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. It should be noted that the remarks herein with respect to the patentability of the independent claim(s), render the remaining rejections moot, that is the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Office Results or Savage. Therefore, these rejections have not been separately addressed at this stage but applicants retain the right to do so at a later stage should it become necessary.

IV. CONCLUSION

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

PATENT

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: February 12, 2010

By: /James R. Banowsky/

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

February 12, 2010
Date

/Rimma Oks/
Rimma Oks

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004